

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/801,583	KEITH, CHRISTOPHER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer Liversedge	3692	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jennifer Liversedge. (3)_____.

(2) Kevan Morgan. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 30 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lupien (5,101,353) and Jain (6,343,278).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim 1 was discussed in detail with regards to two particular points. The first area of focus was regarding claim language directed to holding orders prior to submission for execution. The concept of holding was discussed in view of Lupien as well as general practices in the field. The concept of holding is further expanded on in the second point of discussion, primarily with regards to the conditions by which the items being held are released, that being by a market condition which is applied to the holding tank. Specific resolution regarding the claims was not reached, however, the examiner will review with a primary focusing on portfolio and a full search will be submitted to STIC. An amendment will be submitted and examiner will review in light of research to be conducted as outlined (review with primary and STIC).